

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated August 14, 2006, claims 11-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101; claims 1-10 were rejected under § 112, ¶ 2; and claims 1-20 were rejected under § 102 and/or § 103 over www.google.com (web.archive.org dated January 2001) (hereinafter “Google document”).

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 11-20 were rejected under § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 11 has been amended to address the § 101 rejection. Withdrawal of the § 101 rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to address the § 112, ¶ 2 rejections of claims 1 and 12-14. Withdrawal of the § 112 rejections is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

All claims were rejected as being anticipated, or in the alternative, rendered obvious, by the Google document describing WebSearch and SiteSearch features provided by Google. The custom WebSearch feature provided by Google allows for Internet search “on your portal or destination site.” Google Document, at 3. Moreover, the WebSearch feature “enables your site visitors to search the Internet.” *Id.* “With Google, your site visitors can search over one billion pages of the Internet.” *Id.* As further described on page 5 of the Google document, the WebSearch feature is a “hosted solution that allows your visitors to conduct web and specialty searches on your site, with the results provided within your own template.” *Id.* at 5.

The SiteSearch feature “enables your site visitors to search just your site” *Id.* at 3. The SiteSearch feature is a “fully customized way for users to search just your site.” *Id.* The SiteSearch feature is also a “hosted solution that allows your visitors to conduct web and specialty searches on your site” *Id.* at 9.

In effect, the Google document describes features provided by the Google search engine that allow a provider of a website to incorporate a search feature (either the WebSearch feature

or the SiteSearch feature) onto the provider's website to allow for web searching. However, the Google document does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 1, which recites a discovery agent finding one or more prospective e-services based on one or more search parameters, where the e-services are published by service provider organizations in respective e-service descriptions, and where finding the one or more prospective e-services comprises matching the one or more search parameters with the published e-service descriptions. In the Google document, there is no mention or suggestion of e-service descriptions published by service provider organizations that can be matched by a discovery agent to one or more search parameters.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated, or rendered obvious, by the Google document.

Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as corresponding independent claims. Moreover, claim 7, which depends from claim 1, further recites matching the one or more search parameters with published e-service descriptions contained in e-service data sheets. In the rejection of claim 7, the Office Action stated that the Google document "deal[s] with well known protocol features," and "these are inherently or taught in the Google document" at pages 3 and 6-7. There is no mention on these pages of the Google document, inherently or otherwise, of e-service descriptions that are contained in e-service data sheets. The Office Action has cited to no evidence and has not provided any convincing rationale regarding why use of an e-service data sheet would have been inherently part of the Google document. In fact, since the Google document provides absolutely no mention or suggestion of e-service descriptions, it is noted that the Google document cannot teach or suggest the use of e-service data sheets.

Similarly, with respect to dependent claims 8 and 9, which both depend from claim 1, the Google document fails to teach or suggest use of e-service descriptions in a mark-up language document or an XML document.

Independent claim 11 is allowable for at least similar reasons as claim 1. Dependent claims of claim 11 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 11. Moreover, newly added dependent claims 21-28 are also allowable for similar reasons as corresponding independent claims.

Appln. Serial No. 10/066,097
Amendment Dated November 14, 2006
Reply to Office Action Mailed August 14, 2006

Allowance of all claims is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 (10007908-1).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Nov 14, 2006



Dan C. Hu
Registration No. 40,025
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
Telephone: (713) 468-8880
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883